



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE ARTICLE "JESUS" IN THE THREE ENCYCLOPÆDIAS.

---

By REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.,  
Glasgow, Scotland.

---

WHEN the second volume of the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* was published (1899), widespread attention was drawn to the article on Jesus by Dr. Sanday as not only the gem of the volume, but an ornament to the entire work. Since then even more attention has, for other reasons, been excited by the corresponding article, from the pen of Dr. Bruce, in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1901), edited by Professor Cheyne and Dr. Sutherland Black. And, still later, in the ninth volume of the new third edition of the kindred work of reference in Germany, Hauck's *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* (1901), the article on the same subject, by Professor Zöckler, has had special attention challenged to it by its being postponed from its alphabetical place in the preceding volume and made to open the present one. These are indications of the paramount interest which this subject has at present for the public mind; the writers to whom it has been intrusted in these three works are men of conspicuous knowledge and ability; and it may be profitable to compare the modes in which they have acquitted themselves of their task.

### I.

Dr. Bruce's performance has created something like consternation among his own friends on account of the negative tone by which it is pervaded; and this has been felt to be the more painful because, through the lamented author's death before its publication, it has come to the public with the air of a last will and testament. Certain Unitarians have been claiming it for their own and using it for their peculiar purposes, forgetting that, if it were really as they suppose—if one who up to the day of

his death had eaten the bread of a Trinitarian church had left behind him a legacy of Unitarianism—the scientific interest of the incident would disappear in the importance of the article as a document in estimating the author's character. They might have been restrained by the very first words, in which Jesus is spoken of as not only the author, but the object, of the Christian faith, and there are plenty of other indications throughout the article which prove to a discerning eye that the distinguished author had no intention of turning his back in this last product of his pen on the testimony of his whole preceding life.

It cannot, however, be denied that the representation of Jesus is humanitarian, while the references to his higher claims are most meager. So strongly has this been felt that the idea has been mooted in certain quarters that Dr. Bruce's manuscript may have been subjected to editorial curtailment or modification. I am, however, in a position to state that this is not the case, the manuscript having been courteously submitted to my inspection; and I have the highest authority for the statement that no limitations were imposed on Dr. Bruce beyond his general acquaintance with the aim and method of the new dictionary.

To some of Dr. Bruce's friends it may appear that the tone of the article is to be accounted for by the failing power of one on whom disease had already laid a fatal hand. But a close examination will hardly justify such an idea. Certainly there is not present the buoyancy of his best work; but every sentence is written with precision; and the whole is not very different from what might have been anticipated by anyone who had read with care his commentary on the synoptic gospels.

A more likely explanation lies in the fact, which close students of Dr. Bruce's writings have noted for many years, that the apologetic habit had been growing upon him, and that it had at length become so confirmed that he was unable to address himself to a subject in any other attitude. Almost unconsciously he had in his mind a reader acquainted with everything that could be said against the Christian positions, and he confined himself to demonstrating what such a fair inquirer must concede at the least. But the keeping up of such an attitude reacts on the

apologete himself, who, by thus confining his attention to the minimum of truth, loses the warming and invigorating influence of the maximum. While Dr. Bruce's later books may be of great value to those whose faith is in danger of being lost altogether, they are disappointing to those who are already standing on securer ground.

Another influence which may have restrained the hand of the author is that the article was designed for an encyclopædia; because, even when editors impose no unusual limitations, it is always difficult to decide how much should go into such a work, and it is not unnatural to conclude that it ought to be the minimum. Evidently this was Dr. Bruce's conclusion; for he has cut down to the very bone what he had to say, rigidly excluding the dogmatic construction of the facts and restraining himself to the baldest narrative. It is a pity he did not feel, or was not encouraged to recognize, that on such a subject he might have allowed himself ample latitude, and that the utterance of his whole mind would have proved of the deepest interest to readers in every quarter of the world.

The most disappointing feature of the article is the coldness of its tone. Here again, of course, the question is: What is becoming in an encyclopædia? Ought an expert, writing in such a place, to expatiate with warmth on his favorite subject, or ought he to state the facts without emotion? Certain it is that many an expert would have written about some trivial novelty of science or invention with more enthusiasm than has been here displayed in dealing with the highest of all subjects. Yet it may be urged that there are minds on which the cool statement makes the deepest impression; and readers of Dr. Bruce's works will not forget the warmth into which he habitually kindles, when writing on a larger scale, in speaking of the Son of man.

The article opens with a brief but vigorous discussion of the "sources," in which the author announces himself as an adherent of what is known as the two-source theory, and reiterates his well-known preference for Mark. Then, following out his design of confining himself to a minimum, he announces that he

will relate only what is common to the synoptists. Accordingly he passes at a bound over everything relating to the infancy and childhood, as this lies outside the triple tradition. Not the slightest allusion is made to the supernatural birth—a procedure the reason assigned for which seems to be very insufficient. Then the public ministry is presented under four broad aspects: first, a preaching ministry among the people at large; second, a teaching ministry among disciples; third, a healing ministry; fourth, a prophetic or critical ministry, antagonistic to current conceptions and embodiments of righteousness.

Under the first of these, occasion is taken to explain the method of teaching by parables; and, in connection with this, strong adhesion is given to the view of Jülicher, that the intention attributed by the evangelists to Jesus of using the parable as a veil to conceal the truth is mistaken:

It is not credible that Jesus would either cherish or avow such an inhuman intention, though it is credible that in his bitter disappointment at the meager fruit of his popular ministry he might express himself in a way that might easily be misunderstood on the principle of reading intention in the light of result.

Under the second division a summary is given of the teaching of Jesus; and this is the only part where the style swells out into something like sonority, and the impression made is deep and convincing. The statement concludes with the fine sentence that the spiritual intuitions of Jesus are "pure truth, valid for all ages; God, man, and the moral ideal cannot be more truly or happily conceived." After this the mention of Peter's confession leads on to a consideration of what may be called the claims of Jesus. But here Dr. Bruce advances with an extremely cautious step. To the chosen self-designation of Jesus, "the Son of man," he attaches the minimum of significance, inclining to the old notion of Paulus, recently revived by Lietzmann and Wellhausen, that it means no more than "man," and fighting very shy of its messianic reference. Indeed, the messianic claim of Jesus is to Dr. Bruce more a difficulty than an explanation; and he speaks with extreme severity of the school in Germany which has recently represented the messianic

and eschatological elements as occupying a foremost place in the consciousness of Jesus.

Under the third head there is a more cordial acknowledgment of the miraculous element in the ministry of Jesus than might have been expected from the general tone of the article; and the evidence is presented with powerful effect which is furnished by the theories invented by enemies to account for the miracles; such as that of Herod, that he was John the Baptist risen from the dead, and that of the Pharisees, that he was in league with Beelzebub. These were thoroughly characteristic suggestions, however absurd; and they would not have been propounded at all unless there had been a problem to explain.

In describing the conflict with the religious leaders—the last of the four elements into which the ministry is divided—Dr. Bruce is handling a thoroughly congenial theme. Probably at all times the portion of his Master's example which he found it easiest to imitate was his opposition to traditionalism and pharisaism. The readers of his works are aware how trenchantly he always wrote on this theme; and in the present instance his pen has lost none of its cunning.

Coming to the passion, Dr. Bruce divides the incidents, in about equal proportions, into two kinds: those which are incontestable, and those which criticism has attacked with greater or less success. Of the latter he seems not disinclined to sacrifice a considerable number; yet, "when criticism has done its work, the passion narratives remain," he asserts, "in their main features history, not legend." "A history," he adds, "how profoundly significant, as well as moving!" The theory of criticism is that incidents were invented at the suggestion of Old Testament predictions; but Dr. Bruce holds that the movement of the apostolic mind was in the opposite direction, the application of Old Testament texts to the incidents being in some cases so imaginative that it could never have been thought of unless the incidents had been there beforehand.

On the burning question of the resurrection the following is Dr. Bruce's deliverance:

Christianity could not have entered on its victorious career unless the followers of the Crucified had believed that he not only died, but rose again. . . . The primitive disciples believed that their Master rose on the third day, and that he would soon come to the earth again; and this faith and hope became the common possession of the apostolic church. The faith and the hope both find support and justification in the words of Jesus as reported by the evangelists.

This is an imperfect sketch of a deeply interesting article, in which the most successful feature is the development of the ethical teaching of Jesus. No doubt the ethical teaching of our Lord is that which lies most conspicuously on the surface of the gospels; but one misses in Dr. Bruce's pages almost any reference to those subtler elements of the teaching of Jesus in which the Christian church has always believed the most solemn and moving part of his message to lie. There is hardly a word on the relation of Jesus to God or the significance of his death. The great text in Matt. 11:25 is referred to, but not with anything like the impressiveness of writers like Wendt or Keim. Dr. Bruce says that what the primitive Christians asked about Jesus was, first, what he taught; secondly, what he did; and thirdly, what he suffered. But what the hearts of men from the first asked was, who he was, and with what object he had appeared in this world; and without a doubt it was to the belief that in him the eternal love had incarnated itself for the purpose of taking away the sin of the world that the Christian church owed its origin and its permanence.

## II.

Professor Sanday's article deserves all the praise which has been so liberally bestowed upon it. In fact, it would be difficult to find a parallel among the articles of any encyclopædia to the thoroughness and fineness of its work. It is said that Professor Sanday is preparing a larger work on the same subject, and the article has all the appearance of having had the benefit of wider studies.

In the first place, the writer has taken plenty of room. His article is three times the length of Dr. Bruce's, almost attaining the dimensions of a book. Yet there is no prolixity. Every

page is packed with matter. The author has an admirable way, not only of dividing his subject under clear and simple heads, but of subdividing what falls under each head into a number of particulars, so that he keeps himself always to the point, and rapidly quits a topic when he has done with it.

In this way he passes all the features of the life of Christ under review; and, besides telling the actual story, he gives, at the beginning, a comprehensive account of the condition of the world which was the matrix of that life, and, at the close, a still more careful estimate of the influence exercised by Jesus on subsequent centuries. Special emphasis is laid on those topics which have recently come much into discussion, and the reader will here become acquainted with what has been done by specialists during the last few years to illuminate this or that point of the subject. Thus, the bearing of the apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical writings which appeared between the Old Testament and the New on the ideas and language of Jesus is recognized; the essence of countless books on "the kingdom of God" and "the Son of man" is distilled into a few pages; and the points are given of the controversies which have been raised of late concerning the Lord's Supper; while older difficulties, like those connected with miracles, are fully dealt with. The strong features of the article are its comprehensiveness and the way in which the knowledge of the reader is brought up to date on what may be called the problems of the life of Christ.

On all these subjects Professor Sanday has not only read widely and reflected long, but has made up his own mind, and it is seldom that he declines to express a decided opinion. His judgments will confirm the convictions of those whose minds are confused with the din of controversy, while they will command the respect of all who have reflected on these topics themselves. It cannot, indeed, be said that his conclusions are all equally reassuring. His speculations, for instance, on the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, which he believes to be a rule for Christian society, but inapplicable to human society in general, will raise in many minds the question: Is not Christ, then, the moral lawgiver for the whole life of humanity? and, if not, who is to fill this great



place? In dealing with the very difficult idea of "the Son of man," while rightly holding that the messianic reference is the primary one, he concedes too much to the contention that it can ever have been a mere translation of the Aramaic term for "man." When the Greek language had to render from the Hebrew the exact equivalent of this Aramaic term, in the sense simply of "man," it did not do so in the words with which it renders the favorite name of Jesus; and this change must have been based on a difference in the mouth of Jesus himself, if, indeed, he spoke Aramaic in his public addresses. What Dr. Sanday says of the Lord's Supper will be felt to have a certain vagueness; and he should not have assumed without argument that Christian baptism is referred to in the third chapter of John as a birth of water and of the Spirit. But it would be unreasonable to expect that in a single article all the problems of the life of Christ should be solved. It is one of the evidences of the divine greatness of this subject that it is constantly throwing new questions to the surface.

Professor Sanday assumes from the first the attitude of a Christian believer, and nothing is more remarkable in the whole performance than the delicate fervor of faith that is combined with fidelity to facts and fairness toward the opinions of others. He holds that Jesus was from his baptism perfectly conscious of his messianic vocation, and resolved to found the kingdom of God upon earth; but he had first to transform the conceptions of the kingdom entertained by his contemporaries; and this delayed his full manifestation of himself, while it accounts for the comparative rarity of testimonies from his own lips in the gospels. But his work, toward the close, centered more and more in his own person, and he spoke about himself with growing freedom. Like Dr. Bruce, Professor Sanday begins with the story as it is told in the triple tradition; but, after finishing this, he goes back to those incidents which have less ample documentary support, holding that "it by no means follows that what is peculiar to a single gospel is by that fact stamped as less historical." He gives a long and most sympathetic discussion of the infancy, showing good reason why the experience of Mary

should have been handed down only by Luke. The fourth gospel is accepted as authoritative, and its guidance is followed, especially in determining the dates of the ministry. In speaking of the Perea period, for example, the author says :

The historical value of the fourth gospel comes out strongly in this period. Rarely has any situation been described with the extraordinary vividness and truth to nature of chap. 7. Not less graphic are the details of chap. 9, and there is marked decision in the statements of 10 : 22 f., 40 f.; 11 : 54-57.

Professor Sanday is not shackled by any rigid doctrine of inspiration and, therefore, from time to time acknowledges that the record on which he is commenting may be imperfect or even mistaken ; but he does not display a particle of the inclination to domineer over his text and glory in the exposure of its assumed imperfections which is so unamiable a feature of much modern criticism. He writes, on the contrary, with unfailing reverence, and with pride in his authorities, being evidently glad when he is able to vindicate their absolute trustworthiness and surrendering their testimony even on little things only with hesitation and dislike. Here lies the deep gulf between a believing and disbelieving treatment of the record, as Delitzsch pointed out in the theological literature of his own country; and it looks as if it may soon be the line of demarkation in the religious literature of this country also.

The weakness of this remarkable article lies in its criticism, and this may, in spite of its freshness, soon render it antiquated. The discussion of the "sources" in the introduction is meager, and in marked contrast with the expansiveness which the writer permits himself elsewhere; and, although in the course of the article there are valuable critical principles casually mentioned—the remark is specially important, that the miracles of the triple tradition include, not only those of healing, but such as the feeding of the five thousand—yet these are not compacted into systematic form, and it may be questioned if they go deep enough. In England the comfortable belief has long prevailed that with the overcoming of the Tübingen theory serious attacks on the credibility of the gospels had come to an end, and that

Bishop Lightfoot, in his reply to *Supernatural Religion*, had practically said the last word. Old Testament critics, while dismembering the Old Testament books, have kept on assuring the Christian public that there was no danger of a similar process being applied to the historical books of the New Testament. But in Germany, France, and Holland there has been practically no cessation of the disintegrating processes of the Tübingen school, although the reasons for setting the incidents aside have somewhat altered; and the Walpurgis dance of interpolation and mythification, with its anonymous authors and redactors, has swept over the gospels and the Acts in exactly the same way as it is doing over the books of the Old Testament. There are vast quantities of material of this kind accumulated in the theological literature of the continent; and it is not likely that hands will be wanting to transfer it to our shores. The skepticism of the Ritschlian school in regard to the miraculous birth and the bodily resurrection of our Lord is not likely to remain long without imitation in this country, when the Ritschlian doctrines in general are exerting so widespread an influence; and disbelief on points so cardinal as these will unquestionably be only like the letting out of water. The criticism of Wendt and Holtzmann breaks up even so compact a gospel as that of Mark, going behind it to a supposed original from which the greatest miracles and the grandest sayings of our Lord are eliminated. There are scholars who, operating with such canons as these—that Jesus can have uttered no testimony to his own messiahship before the great confession of Peter, and that he cannot have spoken a single word about the distant future, because he expected the world to come to an end within a single generation—contract the authentic history within still narrower limits. Should such a conflict be upon us, Professor Sanday would no doubt be one of the most intrepid defenders of the citadel of the faith; but in this article he has given scarcely any indication of the weapons by which such an attack could be repulsed.

### III.

If the strong point of Dr. Bruce's article is the exposition of the ethical teaching of Jesus, and that of Dr. Sanday's the

statement of the actual state of the discussion, the strong point of Dr. Zöckler's article is the registration of relevant literature. In it anyone can learn what to read, either on the life of Christ as a whole or on any section of the subject; and this, it is easy to see, is one of the principal uses of an encyclopædia. Dr. Zöckler supplies a history of the literature of the life of Christ from the earliest times down to the books of yesterday—from the earliest attempts of Christian bards to tell the divine story in verse down to the caricatures of socialists and atheists, who, it would appear, on the continent, make use of this strange form of insolence in support of their propaganda.

We are, according to this authority, at present in the critical and scientific stage of the long development. This stage dates from the writings of Schleiermacher and Hase, and its writers are of two schools—the negative and the positive. The negative school has manifested itself in three phases—first, the mythical, of which Strauss was the great protagonist, representing the miracles as a crown of legend woven for the head of Jesus, the details being suggested by the miracles attributed to the heroes of the Old Testament; secondly, the criticism of tendency, which accounted for the New Testament books as pamphlets produced by the controversies of the apostolic age and by the attempts made to reconcile the diverse parties, Baur being here the foremost man, and his subordinates such names as Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, and Volkmar; and, thirdly, the eclectic phase, which is most prominent at the present hour, and in which the ideas of myth and tendency are both made use of, while recourse is also had to the older naturalistic explanations of miracle, and an idealizing activity is at work, volatilizing the evangelic history into legend and romance; Renan's being here the principal name, while others are Schenkel, Keim, Wittichen, Schmidt, the author of *Supernatural Religion*, Réville, Loman, and Brandt. The positive school has carried on a vigorous and successful apologetic against all these different phases of negative criticism; and Zöckler gives happy and generous characterizations of the principal works that have appeared, not only in German, but in French, Dutch, and English also.

In addition to this history of opinion on the subject as a whole, the author carefully traces the phases of opinion and enumerates the most important books, and even learned articles, on every important problem of the life; and from these lists students will obtain excellent guidance for the study of special aspects of the subject. Sometimes, indeed, the author himself appears to grow a little weary of the endless enumeration of authorities; and in one place he actually refers to Sanday's article for the full names of a number of German books.

It is a remarkable fact that of the articles in the three encyclopædias the German one is decidedly the most orthodox. And this is not the only indication furnished by the new edition of the greatest theological encyclopædia in the world that there are large sections of the learned world in Germany on which extreme views in criticism have made little impression, and that, in the conflicts lying before us in this country and America, we may be able to fetch our weapons of defense from the country which we have been wont to think of as the source of all that is arbitrary and extreme. While giving very fully the history of the criticism of the "sources," Zöckler himself does not acknowledge any varying scale of values as belonging to the four gospels or to any portions of them. At the most, he only acknowledges a certain subjective element in John's reports of our Lord's discourses, and of course he recognizes that one of the evangelists is more important for one purpose and another for another; but, while even Dr. Sanday speaks freely of the mistakes of the evangelists, I do not remember that Dr. Zöckler acknowledges a single real discrepancy, unless it be in the date of the Last Supper, where he prefers the account of John. He goes so far as to say that nothing but prejudice stands in the way of believing that Matthew may have produced our first gospel as it stands by translating his own *logia* into Greek and furnishing them with historical settings. His belief in the traditional view of Jesus adopted by Christianity is no hesitating one, but confident and full-blooded, and he writes as one who knows himself able to give an account to all comers of the faith that is in him.

The following extract, on the burning question of our Lord's bodily resurrection, will be read with interest, both on account of the information it conveys as to the present state of opinion in Germany and as a specimen of the author's style:

The vision theory exerts an almost unlimited sovereignty at present among the ranks of theological liberalism, and this in such a way that by the representatives of this tendency who have advanced farthest toward the left the visionary appearance of Christ seen by the disciples is conceived as purely subjective, whereas the more moderate liberalism seeks to refer the appearances of the Risen One to objective, that is, in a certain sense real and God-caused sights or visions. The former modification virtually ends in representing the belief in the resurrection as having arisen from the hallucination or self-deception of the disciples; thus Renan, Strauss, H. Lang, Hausrath, Holsten, on the whole also H. Ewald. On the contrary, the representatives of the objective vision theory claim, if not a bodily, yet a spiritual reality for the self-manifestations of the Christ, who now lives in a higher form of existence. Christ is, according to them, not indeed in a corporeal manner, but in a spiritual sense, really risen, to live on and reign as the spiritual head of his church; the visions caused by him among the company of his disciples are actual, if only internal, miracles—genuine acts of God, serving for the laying of the foundation of the kingdom of Christ, true manifestations of the exalted Savior to his own, as well as "telegrams from heaven" to the children of God upon earth. So especially Keim, Schweizer, H. Lotze, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, Pfeiderer, and Réville. . . . Both theories, the objective as well as the subjective, differ only in degree, not in fact, and in the one as well as in the other form they are irreconcilable with the historical fact that out of the belief in the resurrection on the part of the apostles there has issued, not a transient and ultimately extinguished religious movement, but the perfect new birth of the spiritual life of humanity, the establishment of a kingdom of truth and love, the victory of which over the powers that resist it is certain, and the everlasting duration of which is beyond all question. By the effects of the faith of the apostles, as seen in the origin of the church and the new birth of the world, the vision hypothesis is condemned in each of the forms which it has heretofore assumed, and in every modification which it ever can assume in the future.

The immediately imminent problem of the life of Christ is the attempt to reconstruct out of our present gospels the apostolic source from which they were derived; and it is possible that this may not be beyond the reach of biblical science, though of course it will afford opportunities for almost unlimited conjecture. To such an attempt those will naturally look with

hope who dislike and distrust dogmatic Christianity; because it is not unnatural to suppose that the original picture may have been more simple and human than the one elaborated at a later period. If, however, this should turn out to be the case, it would not necessarily follow that the simpler representation is the more correct. Later information may be, not only fuller, but more accurate than a first report. The parable of the Prodigal Son occurs only in Luke, which is not the earliest of the gospels; but is there any single thing attributed to our Lord which bears his stamp more unmistakably? Certain it is that the simpler and less miraculous the story of Jesus becomes, the more difficult is it to reconcile it with the facts of history indubitably disclosed in the writings of Paul. From these documents we learn with absolute certainty that within a quarter of a century after our Lord's death, and before any one of our present gospels was written, there was received without question in the young Christian communities a Christology substantially identical with that which is now the faith of Christendom. Whence was this derived? If it can be shown that it was not derived from the tradition which forms the basis of the synoptic gospels, then it is certain that the infant church must have been also in possession of another tradition, virtually identical with the gospel of John; for there is nothing of importance in the Christology of John that is not to be found also in the epistles of Paul.

The acknowledged fact that the gospels did not come into existence till at least a generation after the passing of Jesus from the earth will always afford to what may be called scrupulous historical consciences the opportunity of doubting whether in the interval the facts may not have been tampered with, and this alarm may at any time communicate itself to the general public. It is with the view of meeting such a state of mind that a writer like Resch has, with the labor of a lifetime, endeavored to reconstruct the apostolic source; and he is able to persuade himself that he can present the record as it existed within half a dozen years of the crucifixion. It is impossible to follow his course even at a distance without being infected with his enthusiasm; and, from the historical point of view, the attempt is of engrossing

interest. But it cannot be ignored that too frequently the motive of such reconstructions is a different one; it is the desire to eliminate or to minimize the supernatural. On this account the testimony of Paul will probably in the near future assume more and more importance, as it is seen that the interval between the death of Jesus and the writing of the gospels is not a blank, but is filled with historical documents of the very first order, testifying to a faith in the divinity of our Lord so calm, widespread, and undisputed that it can be explained only as the reflex of Christ's own testimony concerning himself.

---

### A Meditation.

---

**John 14:1.** "Let not your heart be troubled; believe in God, believe also in me."

Here lies the way to the untroubled heart. Not through avoiding trouble, for it lies in the straight path God has marked out for each of us. Not through shutting the door of the heart against the emotion of sorrow when trouble comes, for so we should shut ourselves out from the promise, "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." Not through stifling the divine instinct of compassion for the sorrow and pain of the world in the interests of a selfish serenity, lest we lose our likeness to the Father who pitieth his children. But through finding the peace of God that lasts through all experiences, and makes every personal grief and every burden borne for another bring forth golden harvests where weeds had grown before.

That peace is the gift of the Master to the soul that responds to the command, "Believe in God; believe also in me;" that seeks no other picture of God than the face of Jesus; that finds no higher conception of God than the life and person of Jesus; that never has a thought of God save in terms of what it knows of Jesus; that never lifts a prayer to God that is not addressed to the heart of Him who said: "Come unto me."

In such a living Christian faith is the secret of the untroubled heart.

WILLIAM P. MERRILL.

CHICAGO.